

AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

The Applicant submits herewith amendments to the claims, specification, and drawings. The following is an excerpt from 37 CFR § 1.116:

37 CFR 1.116. Amendments after final action or appeal.

(b) After a final rejection or other final action (§ 1.113) in an application or in an ex parte reexamination filed under § 1.510, or an action closing prosecution (§ 1.949) in an inter partes reexamination filed under § 1.913, amendments may be made canceling claims or complying with any requirement of form expressly set forth in a previous Office action. Amendments presenting rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal may be admitted. ...

In the claim amendments, claims 37-39 have been canceled. These canceled claims relate to a separate embodiment that will be the subject of a continuing application. The claims of the Present Application were the subject of a restriction/election. The Applicant does not wish to address the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections of claims 37 and 38 in this reply. However, based upon the claim cancelations, rejections of claims 37 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 112 and 102 are now moot.

Claim Objections

In §4 of the Detailed Action Section of your Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 12 and 21 because they depend upon canceled claims 10 and 21 respectively. The Examiner treated claim 12 as though it depended upon claim 1. The Examiner required appropriate correction.

Claim 12 has been amended to depend on claim 1.

Claim 21 was previously canceled, and has not been revived herewith. However, claim 24 depends upon canceled claim 21. The Applicant believes that the Examiner was referring to claim 24 in his objection. Claim 24 has been amended to depend on claim 15 in response to the Examiner requirement.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

In §5 of the Detailed Action Section of your Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 12-14, 24, 35-38, and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

In §9 of the Detailed Action Section of your Office Action, the Examiner stated that claims 1-5, 9, 12-14, 24, 35-36, and 42 would be allowable if rewritten

to overcome rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and the objection to the Drawings set forth in your Office Action, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 1 was amended to comply with all of the Examiner's requirements to overcome the rejections. The term "support means" has been changed to "means for supporting" throughout the claim. Claim 1 was further amended on line 15 to replace the phrase "a means for mounting with at least two mounting points" with the phrase "a means for mounting said rigid bracket means to the means for supporting with at least two mounting points."

Claims 13 and 14 were similarly amended, substituting the term "means for supporting" for "support means," according to the Examiner's requirements.

Regarding claim 24, the "protrusion" was a term referred to prior to the previous set of amendments. In his Reply to your First Office Action, the term "protrusion" was changed to "resting device." Claim 24 still retained the old term reciting this element. Therefore, claim 24 is amended herewith to substitute the term "resting device" for the term "protrusion" throughout the claim. This amendment along with the amendment making claim 24 dependent upon claim 15 should satisfy the Examiner's requirements regarding claim 24.

Claims 37 and 38 were canceled. Therefore the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections of these claims are now moot.

Finally, regarding claim 42, the Examiner objected to the "locking mechanism" recited as included within the "pivot mechanism" in element (d) of the claim. Claim 42 has been amended to cancel that feature from the claim. Furthermore, regarding the Examiner's assertion that the claim omits an operative connection between elements "two rigid padded straight elements" of a "resting device" and the "rigid bracket," claim 42 has been amended to include the "pivot mechanism" in the preamble as an integral part of the "rigid bracket." Elements (b) through (d) describe the functions of the "pivot mechanism."

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATION

Because the "locking mechanism" feature was canceled from claim 42, this feature should no longer be required for inclusion in the Drawings. However, the function of the pivot mechanism as recited in claims 1, 15, and 42 that illustrates the leg resting element to move angularly ranging from the longitudinal

direction of the shaft to a direction essentially perpendicular to the shaft may not be shown adequately in the figures. FIG. 15 illustrates how the pivot mechanism works. FIG. 15(a), FIG. 15(c), and FIG. 15(d) show the leg-resting element in the horizontal position, while FIG. 15(b) and FIG. 15(e) show the leg-resting element flush along the longitudinal portion of the shaft. The Applicant believes that the addition of new FIG. 15(f) will serve to show the leg-resting element in a variety of angular positions as recited in the specification and claims. No new matter has been added. The Applicant respectfully requests that the Drawings be amended to include FIG. 15(f). This drawing is being added for illustrative purposes only. However, if the Examiner believes that addition of this drawing goes beyond the scope of amendments permissible after final rejection, the Applicant will not insist on the drawing amendment.

Should the Examiner decide that the addition of FIG. 15(f) is appropriate, then an amendment to the Specification is required. This amendment is also submitted herewith. However, it should not be entered if new FIG. 15(f) is not entered.

REQUEST FOR REVERSAL OF REJECTIONS AND ALLOWANCE

Based upon the aforementioned amendments, the claims still pending in the Present Application should be allowable as stated by the Examiner in §9 of the Detailed Action Section of your Office Action. The Applicant believes that he has complied with all of the Examiner's requirements for correction based on her objections and rejections. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reverse her rejections of the pending claims and allow the entire Present Application.

APPLICANT'S ATTEMPT TO PROVIDE A COMPLETE RESPONSE

By submitting this reply to your Office Action, the Applicant attempted in good faith to reply to every ground of objection and rejection raised by the Examiner. However, if for any reason, this reply proves to be deficient, the Applicant respectfully requests the courtesy of an Advisory Office Action that would permit Applicant to correct any deficiency.

Alternatively, if the Examiner believes that any such deficiencies are correctable by examiner amendment to bring the Present Application into

condition for allowance, the Agent of Record would welcome a telephone interview with the Examiner to accomplish this goal.

Thank you for your kind attention.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Stanley H. Kremen". The signature is fluid and cursive, with "Stanley" on the first line and "H. Kremen" on the second line.

Stanley H. Kremen,
Registered Patent Agent
Registration No. 51900
Customer No. 34325